

10. Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 140.
11. Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 254-255.
12. Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 165-167.
13. Kochkin A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 78, 123, Exh. 1056, 1059; and Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 135, 152.
14. Kochkin A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 78; and Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 176-178.
15. Kochkin A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; Exh. 1070.
16. Thrasher J. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; Exh. 1095.
17. Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 147-148.
18. Hinds WC. Expert report *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; exh. 873.
19. Dames & Moore. Final report to Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (March 2, 1987); 4-3.
20. Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 131-132, 165.
21. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 676-678.
22. Wilhelm RE. Affidavit *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989.
23. Hansen P. Affidavit *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; and Hollingsworth J. Affidavit *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989.
24. Daniel W. A case-control comparison of immunologic and psychological parameters in the multiple chemical sensitivity syndrome. Multiple Chemical Sensitivities Workshop, Association of Occupational and Environmental Clinics, in press.
25. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Newton v. Weyerhaeuser Co., U.S. Dist. Ct. Florida, 1988; 151-164.
26. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 219-2.
27. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 219-221.
28. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point Tank Car Litigation, No. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 219-221.
29. Broughton A. Deposition Testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 28-29, 70-75; exh. 1283, 1284, 1285; and Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Newton v. Weyerhaeuser Co., U.S. Dist. Ct. Florida, 1988; 49-51, 53-54.
30. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Newton v. Weyerhaeuser Co., U.S. Dist. Ct. Florida, 1988; 53-54, 390.
31. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 75-7.
32. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 657-666.
33. Madison R. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 256, 355-356; and Thrasher J. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; exh. 1095.
34. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 276-280.
35. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 219-221.
36. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Crown Point tank car litigation, no. 3AN-86-5812, Alaska Super. Ct. 1989; 220.
37. Broughton A. Deposition testimony *in re* Poppy Lane Gravel Pit, Super. Ct. Alaska, 1985; 131-132. 38.
38. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Conflict of interest. *Ann Int Med* 118:646-647 (1993).

Faulty Conclusions

This letter is prompted by Rall's editorial on media and science in the January issue of *EHP* (102:10). Rall implies that bad reporting is being conducted concerning dioxin, CFCs, and asbestos. Rall concludes

by assuming that he is correct in assigning a high level of risk to each of these subjects. Accordingly, corrections need to be made in the editorial policies of science reporting. His remedy is to make an internal review of such policies (no doubt chaired by himself). The purpose, undoubtedly, would be to establish policies consistent with Rall's point of view. I take exception to these conclusions and illustrate my point by discussing the case of dioxin.

My criticism stems from what I consider bad reporting by Rall. Any good article needs to have complete references cited. In the case of dioxin, the references were incomplete, making it very difficult to check the validity of Rall's conclusions. On tracking down the study of Fingerhut et al. [*New England Journal of Medicine*, 324:212 (1991)], the following conclusion was made by the authors: "This study of mortality among workers with occupational exposure to TCDD does not confirm the high relative risks reported for many cancers in previous studies. . ." They further concluded that the study established an upper level of risk that could be anticipated in humans exposed to a high level of TCDD. In other words, for the public at large, the risk is very small, and the reporting by the *New York Times* (as cited by Rall) is correct that exposure to dioxin "is now considered by some experts to be no more risky than spending a week sunbathing." To continue to keep the public stirred up as Rall would do is most inappropriate. Unless, of course, you were seeking government funds for more research.

Perhaps Rall should institute his own recommendation made in his editorial comment and have opposite views published simultaneously with his own. He would quickly discover that there are a few people who take exception to his ideas.

W. Brock Neely
EnviroSoft, Inc.
Midland, Michigan